



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,722	02/28/2002	Paul Andrew Abraham	833.0168USQ	2418

7590

02/15/2005

CHARLES N.J. RUGGIERO, ESQ.  
OHLANDT, GREELEY, RUGGIERO & PERLE, L.L.P.  
10th Floor  
ONE LANDMARK SQUARE  
STAMFORD, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER

PETERSON, KENNETH E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3724

DATE MAILED: 02/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/085,722

Applicant(s)

ABRAHAM ET AL.

Examiner

Kenneth E Peterson

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10 and 14-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8, 10 and 19-32 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 14-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamada, who shows a hair clipper head having two arms (3a,3b) with means (16) for placing the razor head in different predetermined positions.

Yamada's razor head is *capable* of being pivoted by a force applied on the head's bottom flat surface opposite the cutting portion.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4,7 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada.

Yamada, as set forth above, shows a hair clipper with most of the recited limitations including reciprocating linear blades (32, figure 7). While such blades usually are comprised of one moving blade and one stationary blade, Yamada does not explicitly say as much. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is prevalent for such trimmer blades to comprise one reciprocating blade and one stationary blade. An

Art Unit: 3724

example of such is the patent to Kubo '589 (22,23). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have made Yamada's trimmer have one moving blade and one stationary blade, as is prevalent and taught by Kubo, since this is an art recognized equivalent known for this purpose.

5. Claims 1-7 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada in view of Hendrickson.

Yamada, as modified above or not, shows a hair clipper with all of the recited limitations except the gears and push button release mechanism. However, Hendrickson shows that it is well known for razor angle adjustment connectors to comprise two gears (14,24) and a push button release mechanism (32). Hendrickson's push button (32) is a resilient element that could be pressed to disengage one gear from the other.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Yamada by replacing each of his connections with the connection of Hendrickson, since it has been held to be obvious to substitute equivalents known for the same purpose (see MPEP 2144.06).

6. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Yamada is a razor and not a hair clipper. Applicant's attention is drawn to Yamada's figure 7, which shows a hair clipper (32).

Art Unit: 3724

Applicant argues that Yamada has no flat surface opposite the cutter. Attention is drawn to the flat surface on the bottom of Yamada's head.

Applicant has overcome the Kleinman rejection.

Applicant argues that Yamada and Hendrickson are non-analogous to each other. Examiner disagrees. Both are directed to cutting hair and are angleable to match the angle of the surface having the hair to cut. The teachings of one are very much applicable to the other.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 3724

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ken Peterson at 571-272-4512, on Monday-Thursday, 7AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap, can be reached at 571-272-4514. In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that papers be faxed to 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov> or call the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

kp  
February 10, 2005



KENNETH E. PETERSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER